

Julie Bisland:Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 1 - Overall Process/Support/Outreach Issue call on Tuesday, 17 October 2017 at 20:00 UTC

Julie Bisland:Agenda wiki page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_fYJEB&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QIF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=sKarUUM4klhjLlml-1-Oga-rq76QRrGzTTXQAKGDs0&s=kLSxa2C0EEayQqpDfxe6clma90DOWzF57ftPw8szKxg&e=

Vanda Scartezini:hi everyone..

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Hi all

Julie Bisland:Hello Christa :)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO)::-)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Yes all clear

Vanda Scartezini:ok go further

Jonathan Robinson:Regardless of cost-recovery or cost-plus basis, is it established at this point, as to whether this is on a per round basis or across the program as a whole?

Vanda Scartezini:i I beleive on one fits all cost since in my survey in this developing region cost was not the issue

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):I suspect the issue of "affordability" will vary accross both Regions and sectors

avri doria:Alan, should one raise the cost to prevent applicantions?

Phil Buckingham:I think that it would be important to separate out the variable costs to run the "round " and the fixed costs / development costs that ICANN (the corporation) needs to implement / rollout R2 (ie a new computer system / new application system etc) .

Vanda Scartezini:I agree with ALAN - it is our intention to especulate on gTLDs more than we had in 2102?

Alan Greenberg:@Avri, if too low a cost leads to a situation that we find undesireable, then perhaps we do nooe to do that. Or maybe there are other ways to preven speculation.

avri doria:What price level discourages speculation? Was there speculation in 2012?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):fair point to noJeff a good reminder

Jonathan Robinson:@Phil. Regardless of splitting across variable and fixed costs, there is a point of principle as to whether or not the cost-recovery should be spread across multiple rounds

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):should say to note Jeff

Alan Greenberg:I think the first rounds were in a very different world and cannot be used to predict behaviour going forward.

Vanda Scartezini:previous rounds the general investors were not alert about the opportunity, now they are

Alan Greenberg:I don't much care if we use price or something else to discourage "speculation", but I beleive we do not want the equavalent of parked domains in the TLD space. And certainly not when they may predominate.

Vanda Scartezini:understand we are not creating artifitial price but now lower the prices for no reason

avri doria:well, there are apporximations. you could estimate the cost of the the orunds in a year, and then roll any surplus or deficit forward and rebudget and re cost the next year.

Jeff Neuman:we could do that, but so long as there is a much more scientific method of determining the costs of the application process. \$185,000 was a pure guess

avri doria:but now that approximation can be adjusted.

avri doria:based on what was learned in this round

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):I also suspect that whilst we can look towards history of previous "rounds" regarding predicting uptake for future ones is not a simple correlate... Yes things are different between "now" and "then" but we do not have any ideas on what is a saturation point or steady state for

opportunity uptake, nor do we hold predictable data relating to other non purely DNS Industry related effects... we are in some ways trying to crystal ball gaze regarding price point : Impact on speculation / uptake and what you see in a "crystal ball" is very much biased by position and perspective.

Jonathan Robinson:Can the approximation be adjusted? ICANN seems to take the view that the excess application fees may still be required.

Jonathan Robinson:ICANN certainly does not seem to concede that 185k is too much.

Phil Buckingham:I would have thought it would be 2/3 *185K this Round , since the 1/3 "legal contingency " would not be required this time .

Jeff Neuman:Can you repeat what the 10% number is?

Jonathan Robinson:@Cheryl. Good points

Jeff Neuman:I think that is a little low

Phil Buckingham:what a question ! I would refund all applicants within that Round on an equal basis .with the "excess" - whatever that is defined as !!

Jeff Neuman:In this paper, ICANN states that it has \$128million of unspent gTLD application fees ([Jonathan Robinson:There is still the notional 1,000 per year limit AFAIK](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.icann.org_en_system_files_files_draft-2Dreserve-2Dfund-2D12oct17-2Den.pdf&d=DwlFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=sKarUUM4klhjLlml-1-Oga-rq76QRrGzTTXQAkGDs0&s=2h7mQ3djM8yrJJbc1tPZbMZ1H6fIntmyHxUbKxY0uWo&e=) </p></div><div data-bbox=)

Jeff Neuman:A letter was sent from WT 4 to the SSAC, RSSAC, the office of chief technology officer of ICANN, and the GDD to see if their thinking on that has changed.

Alan Greenberg:I do not understand why Compliance is not part of the equation.

Jonathan Robinson:@Jeff. Thanks. Good point; there are two issues regarding what the rate limiting condition is i.e. GDD processing capability and SSAC / RSAC security & stability issues.

Steve Chan:@Jeff, i think the question posed to SSAC, RSSAC, and GDD was more about root-zone scaling. I don't believe we've asked the operational questions yet, as there are quite a few variables this WG would probably need to provide in order for them to do so.

Jonathan Robinson:@Jeff. To your point that we know that 185k will generate significant excess. To be clear, we do not know that US\$185,000 will generate significant excess. We simply do not know what the number of applications will be at 185k or higher or lower.

Jeff Neuman:I am not sure we have agreement on what "gaming" of the process means

Alan Greenberg:Have to leave. Bye

Vanda Scartzini:yeah if there will be a difference then applicant shall pay the difference if change the type

avri doria:gaming - any opportunistic use of policies in a way people frown upon?

Jeff Neuman:I would say 125% of the price differential.

Jeff Neuman:But pulling that out of thin air

Vanda Scartzini:there is another call starting now. need to leave

Vanda Scartzini:thanks you all

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Bye for nowthanks Christa and Sarah.

Jonathan Robinson:Thank-you all.

avri doria:bye

Katrin Ohlmer, DOTZON:bye.

Phil Buckingham:thanks Christa and Sara